

A7
25. The computer display of Claim 24 further including a limiter circuit to limit the upper values of said video amplifier.

Remarks

The Examiner in the Official Action dated March 3, 1999, has objected to Claim 1 as to the spelling of a word. Claims 1, 11, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the Sendelweck patent (4,709,267). Claims 2, 3, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sendelweck in view of Santelmann, Jr. (5,394,067). Claims 4, 5, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sendelweck in view of Santelmann and further in view of Kurisu (5,150,107). Claims 6 - 10, and 16 - 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sendelweck view of Santelmann and Kurisu and further in view of Kato (5,724,519). In addition, new Claims 21 - 25 have had been added herein. By the above amendments and arguments submitted herein, Applicant submits that the present application now presents patentable subject matter and, accordingly, reconsideration and an early allowance is earnestly and respectfully solicited.

The Examiner objected to Claim 1 because the word "window" was misspelled in Claim 1. In fact, the word "window" was also misspelled in certain places in the specification. All of the erroneous spellings have been corrected in the specification and Claims and, accordingly, this objection should now be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 11, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the Sendelweck patent (4,709,267). A review of the Sendelweck patent reveals that it teaches a synchronizing circuit for a video display apparatus and provides inputs for a composite sync signal or separate horizontal and vertical sync signals. The composite sync

signal and the separate horizontal sync signal are applied to a sync separator that provides horizontal and vertical sync pulses in response to a composite sync input or horizontal sync pulses in response to a separate horizontal sync input. Nowhere in the Sendelweck patent is there anticipation or even recognition of the fact that certain windows for display on CRT screen must have a higher luminance to present information in the window for better resolution and color definition for a viewer.

The present invention teaches a system and method for generating high luminance windows on a computer display device. In the preferred embodiment of the present invention, the computer display includes a video amplifier, a window generator, a high-voltage power supply, an automatic beam limiter, and a cathode ray tube. In the preferred embodiment, the video amplifier receives a video signal which includes information for presentation on the computer display. The video amplifier amplifies the received video signal and then applies the amplified video signal to the cathode of the CRT. The high-voltage power supply provides a high-voltage signal to the anode of the CRT. The CRT generates an electron beam which strikes the phosphor located on the inner surface of the viewing screen of the CRT. In the preferred embodiment, a processor device typically provides window control signals to the window generator in the computer display in response to a video application program running on a host computer system. The window control signals advantageously gate the generation of high luminance windows on the computer display, in accordance with the present invention.

As stated above, the Sendelweck patent 4,709,267 does not recognize or even address the situations set forth as solved by the present inventors herein. However, in order to more

fully set forth Applicant's invention herein, the rejected Claims 1, 11, 19 and 20 were amended to specifically recite the inventive features of Applicant's invention. That is, for example, Claim 1, an apparatus claim, now recites a system for generating separate high luminance viewing windows on a display device comprising: a control device coupled to said display device for processing input signals and providing said processed input signals to said display device; and a window generator coupled to said display device for generating window information and applying said window information to said control device to generate said separate high luminance viewing windows on said display device. Claim 11, a method claim, has also been amended to specifically recite a method for generating individual high luminance viewing windows on a display device. Claim 19, an apparatus claim, has also been amended to recite a computer readable medium containing instructions for generating individual high luminance viewing windows on a display device as well as further limitations in the rest of claim. Claim 20, an apparatus claim, was similarly amended to specifically recite that the invention relates to generating separate high luminance viewing windows on a display device which includes means for applying said window pulse to said control device to generate said separate high luminance viewing windows on said display device.

The Sendelweck patent, as set forth above, clearly does not anticipate these claims nor the recitations set forth therein as not addressing or even anticipating Applicant's invention as set forth in these claims. Accordingly, Claims 1, 11, 19 and 20 are now seen to be allowable over the rejections of record and, accordingly, the rejection thereon should be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sendelweck as applied to Claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Santelmann (5,394,067). As set forth above, the Sendelweck patent does not address or even anticipate Applicant's invention herein and the problems solved thereby, and thus this patent is not a valid reference to reject these claims. Further, the Santelmann patent discloses an improved regulated flyback high DC voltage output supply, which is particularly adapted for providing the anode voltage to a CRT, and includes a flyback transformer having its output winding connected to an improved regulator of the type including a string of transistors used to provide a correction signal for stabilizing the output of the supply. Similar to the Sendelweck patent, the Santelmann patent does not address or even anticipate Applicant's invention and the problems solved and, accordingly, it is not a valid reference taken singly or in combination with the Sendelweck patent. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 2, 3, 12 and 13 recite patentable subject matter over Sendelweck in view of Santelmann and, accordingly, these rejections should be withdrawn.

Claims 4, 5, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sendelweck in view of Santelmann as applied to Claim 3 and 13 and further in view of the Kurisu (5,150,107). Kurisu and the invention therein controls a cathode ray tube in order to display desired images on the selected region of the screen. Locations on the screen are identified by horizontal and vertical addresses. The device comprises means for storing information to be displayed on the screen of the cathode ray tube and a control means. The control means selects information for display and generates a display control signal for controlling the cathode ray tube. The display control signal causes the cathode ray tube to

display the selected information and also indicates a predetermined vertical or horizontal address. Neither the Sendelweck nor Santelmann patents anticipate or even address the same problem as set forth by the Applicant herein and as presented in the claims. That is, neither the Sendelweck, Santelmann or Kurisu references even remotely suggest that Applicant's invention is anticipated by the references. None of these references for example, includes a window generator coupled to said display device for generating window information and applying said window information to said control device to generate said separate high luminance viewing windows on said display device. Accordingly, Claims 4, 5, 14 and 15 are seen to be allowable over the rejection of record and, accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn, as well.

Claims 6 to 10, and 16 to 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sendelweck in view of Santelmann and Kurisu and further in view of Kato (5,724,519). The Kato patent recites an invention which relates to a complementary transistor circuit and an amplifier using it, and, in particular, to a video amplifier for amplifying video signals and a high-definition CRT display device. In amplifying inputted video signals by using a multiplexer, a gain controller and the current mirror amplifier, each element circuit is formed by using complementary transistor circuits. The Kato patent is no better than any of the other references set forth in this rejection or any the other rejections discussed above, in that it does not anticipate or even address the same problem as solved by the present invention as to create high luminance window presentations on a screen surrounded by other screen display information. Claims 6 to 10 and 16 to 18 are dependent upon independent claims which have been seen above to be patentable over the rejections and objections of record. Accordingly,

Applicant also submits that Claims 6 to 10 and 16 to 18 are allowable over the references of record and, accordingly, the rejections based thereon should be withdrawn.

In order to adequately set forth Applicant's invention herein, new Claims 21 to 25 are added by this amendment. Claim 21, for example, includes a computer display for generating separately viewed high luminance windows on said display, comprising: a window generator for generating a selectively sized and positioned window on the screen of said computer display, a video amplifier for amplifying received video signals, said amplifier amplifying the received video signals a higher value for the video signals being generated presentation in said high luminance windows, and a computer processor for providing window control signal information to said window generator regarding the size and placement of said window on said display screen. Claims 22 to 25 depend from independent Claim 21 and further define Applicant's invention. None of the references taken singly or combination remotely suggest or even address Applicant's invention which solved an important problem in cathode ray tube presentation devices and, accordingly, these claims as well are seem to be allowable and, accordingly, an early allowance of these claims is also respectfully solicited.

Applicant submits that Claims 1 to 25 in the present application now present patentable subject matter over the references of record and, accordingly, an early allowance of the present application is earnestly and respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard D. Cappels

By: Franklyn C. Weiss
Franklyn C. Weiss
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 23,041

Carr & Ferrell LLP
2225 East Bayshore Road, Suite 200
Palo Alto, CA 94303
Tel.: 650-812-3473
Fax: 650-812-3444